

Message

From: Geller, Mike [Mike.Geller@edelman.com]
Sent: 1/26/2016 6:52:57 AM
To: Parker Lewis [parkeralewis@gmail.com]
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] WSJ

I agree with you. Pls send me the final letter at your earliest convenience (I think I already have but want to make sure we are references conf the right piece) and I'll get to [REDACTED]
I will look to connect with him on the phone ASAP to discuss next steps.
I also think we should get the letter to [REDACTED] so he can get teed up. It will be helpful to him.

----- Original message -----

From: Parker Lewis <parkeralewis@gmail.com>
Date: 01/26/2016 7:35 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Geller, Mike" <Mike.Geller@edelman.com>
Cc:
Subject: [REDACTED] WSJ

Do you have a final copy of Kyle's letter? I think we should send to [REDACTED] so that he and his editors know exactly what we are going on the record with. The letter makes every accusation and claim that we make elsewhere on the website. [REDACTED] piece from everything I can tell is down the fairway, how it could be misconstrued as libel or defamation I have no idea. But, I think if they can see the lengths to which we are willing to go on the record, that may give them comfort. We are going to be on the record, in an all in way. I'll defer to you but this makes sense to me

Ultimately it doesn't matter what the article says, it's just important that it gets published, even if it needs to be softened from its already soft nature. If there is anything you can do to help get them comfortable, that would be helpful.

We believe they are trying to muzzle the WSJ because the attention it will bring will make it that much more difficult to sign up an auditor, which would make it all that much more important.

Spoke with Kyle. He was ok delaying launch a day to allow WSJ to get where they need to be if that helps.

Sent from my iPhone